

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 10-13, 16-18, 40, 41, and 55-59 are pending. Claims 10, 40, 41, and 56-59 were amended. The amendment to claim 10 is supported by disclosure at page 14, lines 20-21, of the specification. Claims 40, 41, and 55-59 were amended for clarity as suggested by the Examiner.

No new matter has been added by this amendment.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 10, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 40 and 41 were rejected for indefiniteness.

With respect to claim 10, the Examiner stated

it is not clear what polypeptide residue(s) are responsible for “reducing the coefficient of friction” or whether it is the “O-linked oligosaccharide moiety” (which is not a peptide)?

Claim 10 has been amended to require that the O-linked oligosaccharide moiety of the polypeptide reduces the coefficient of friction, i.e., it is a post-translationally modified (glycosylated) polypeptide that lubricates. The lubrication activity of the polypeptide is mediated by the O-linked oligosaccharide moiety of the polypeptide. The oligosaccharide moiety is directly linked to a Ser or Thr amino acid via an O-glycosidic alpha linkage (“O-linkage”; see page 14, lines 20-21, of the specification). In view of the amendment and clarification, Applicant submits that this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, and 29 were also rejected for indefiniteness. These claims were canceled; therefore, this rejection is moot.

With respect to claim 40, the Examiner stated that the rejection for indefiniteness would be overcome by amending the claim to read “composition is in the form of a film...”. Claim 41

Applicants: Jay, Gregory D.
U.S.S.N. 09/556,246

was rejected “because it is not clear how tribonectin would be a ‘membrane, foam, gel, or fiber’?” Claims 40 and 41 were both amended as suggested by the Examiner to require that the “composition be in the form of a film.....” Accordingly, this rejection can now be withdrawn.

Claims 56-59 were rejected for indefiniteness for recitation of the term “MSF”, “since the full spelled out words are not used prior to the acronym/abbreviation.” The claims have been amended to delete “MSF” and replace the term with the full spelling of the protein name “megakaryocyte stimulating factor”. Therefore, this rejection can also be withdrawn.

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claims 3-6 and 29 for anticipation by Turner et al. was maintained. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the cancellation of claims 3-6 and 29.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

A petition for extension of time and a check in the amount of \$475.00 is enclosed to cover the petition fee for a three-month extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(3). A Notice of Appeal and a check for the required fee are also filed herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 21486-026CIP.

Applicants: Jay, Gregory D.
U.S.S.N. 09/556,246

Should any questions or issues arise concerning the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Ingrid A. Beattie, Reg. No. 42,306
Attorney for Applicant
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, Massachusetts 02111
Tel: (617) 542-6000

Dated: October 22, 2003

TRA 1844622v1